

Topological Transitions and Enhançon-like Geometries in Calabi-Yau Compactifications of M-Theory

T. Mohaupt¹ §

¹ Theoretisch-Physikalisches Institut, Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena,
Max-Wien Platz 1, D-07743 Jena, Germany

Abstract: We study the impact of topological phase transitions of the internal Calabi-Yau threefold on the space-time geometry of five-dimensional extremal black holes and black strings. For flop transitions and $SU(2)$ gauge symmetry enhancement we show that solutions can always be continued and that the behaviour of metric, gauge fields and scalars can be characterized in a model independent way. Then we look at supersymmetric solutions which describe naked singularities rather than geometries with a horizon. For black strings we show that the solution cannot become singular as long as the scalar fields take values inside the Kähler cone. For black holes we establish the same result for the elliptic fibrations over the Hirzebruch surfaces $\mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2$. These three models exhibit a behaviour similar to the enhançon, since one runs into $SU(2)$ enhancement before reaching the apparent singularity. Using the proper continuation inside the enhançon radius one finds that the solution is regular.

M-theory generalizes quantum field theory by the introduction of extended objects: strings and branes. This leads to surprising new phenomena, which include topological phase transitions and the smoothing or excision of space-time singularities. The enhançon [1] and similar phenomena in Horava-Witten theory [2] show that degenerations in the internal space and the absence of space-time singularities are closely related. In this paper we briefly summarize new results along these lines.¹

The compactification of eleven-dimensional supergravity on a Calabi-Yau threefold yields minimal five-dimensional supergravity coupled to $n_V = h_{1,1} - 1$ abelian vector multiplets and $n_H = h_{2,1} + 1$ hypermultiplets. The hypermultiplets are trivial in the space-time geometries considered here. The couplings of vector multiplets are encoded in the so-called very special geometry of the scalar manifold, which is a cubic hypersurface [3, 4]

$$\mathcal{V}(X) = \frac{1}{6} C_{IJK} X^I X^J X^K = 1, \quad I, J, K = 0, \dots, n_V. \quad (1)$$

The function $\mathcal{V}(X)$ is called the prepotential, and all couplings of the vector multiplets can be computed from it. Thus the Lagrangian is fully determined by the (locally) constant, real symmetric tensor C_{IJK} .

The electric BPS solutions of this theory take the following form [5]:

$$ds^2 = -\mathcal{V}(Y)^{-4/3} dt^2 + \mathcal{V}(Y)^{2/3} dx_{(4)}^2$$

§corresponding author : mohaupt@tpi.uni-jena.de

¹A more detailed account will be given in a separate publication.

$$F_{tm}^I = -\partial_m \left(\mathcal{V}(Y)^{-1} Y^I \right), \quad \phi^x = Y^x / Y^0. \quad (2)$$

The solution is parametrized in terms of rescaled scalar fields $Y^I = aX^I$, where $a^3 = \frac{1}{6}C_{IJK}Y^IY^JY^K = \mathcal{V}(Y)$. This is convenient because all space-time quantities, i.e., the metric, the gauge fields $F_{\mu\nu}^I$ fields and unconstrained scalars ϕ^x are functions of the Y^I . Note that the Y^I (or, equivalently, X^I) are subject to one constraint. The unconstrained scalars ϕ^x , $x = 1, \dots, n_V$ can be obtained by solving (1). Above we used 'special coordinates' $\phi^x = X^x/X^0 = Y^x/Y^0$.

The scalars Y^I have to satisfy the equation $\Delta \left(C_{IJK}Y^JY^K \right) = 0$, where Δ is the (flat) Laplacian with respect to the four spatial coordinates. The solution can be expressed in terms of $n_V + 1$ harmonic functions H_I by solving the so-called generalized stabilization equations [5]:

$$C_{IJK}Y^JY^K = 2H_I. \quad (3)$$

This is a coupled system of quadratic equations for which no closed solution exists, though one knows explicit solutions for specific choices of C_{IJK} . We will only consider single-centered harmonic functions $H_I = c_I + \frac{q_I}{r^2}$, where r is the transverse radial coordinate. Thus the solution depends on $2(n_V + 1)$ parameters: whereas the c_I determine the values of the scalars at infinity (one parameter is fixed by normalizing the metric), the q_I are the electric charges carried by the solution.

Not all such solutions describe black holes. To exhibit potential singularities we look at the Ricci scalar:

$$R = -\frac{6aa' + 4r(a')^2 + 2raa''}{ra^4}, \quad (4)$$

where a was defined above and $a' = \frac{da}{dr}$, etc. As discussed in [5] the solution has a regular horizon isometric to (a slice of) $AdS^2 \times S^3$ if the number of Killing spinors doubles at $r = 0$. In this case the values of the scalars at $r = 0$ are fixed in terms of the charges. This is the celebrated supersymmetric attractor mechanism [6].

We will focus here on the much less studied question whether naked singularities can occur at $r = r_* > 0$, i.e., before reaching a horizon. By inspection of (4) one finds that this happens if either $a(r)$ vanishes at r_* , or if $a'(r)$ or $a''(r)$ diverge.² The presence or absence of such a behaviour imposes inequalities (and not equalities) on the parameters c_I, q_I : singular and regular solutions are equally generic.

We will argue later that the solutions with naked singularities are unphysical in M-theory. But first we have to consider the global structure of the scalar manifold. If our five-dimensional supergravity theory has been obtained by compactification of eleven-dimensional supergravity on a Calabi-Yau threefold [7], then all its data are determined in terms of topological properties of the internal space. In particular, the constants C_{IJK} are the triple-intersection numbers of the Calabi-Yau space, the scalars parametrize deformations of its Kähler structure, and the scalar manifold is a hypersurface in the Kähler cone.³

The Kähler cone has boundaries, which correspond to singular Calabi-Yau spaces. The generic singularities and their physical interpretation were explained in [8]:

1. the collapse of a two-cycle to a zero-cycle is related to a flop transition. In physical terms one gets massless charged hypermultiplets at the boundary. One can add a new Kähler cone to obtain the extended Kähler cone.

²The analysis of other curvature invariants does not change the discussion.

³The scalar corresponding to the total volume of the internal space sits in a hypermultiplet and is constant for our solutions.

2. the collapse of a four-cycle to a two-cycle yields two charged vector multiplets which enhance a $U(1)$ factor of the gauge group to $SU(2)$. One can continue the moduli beyond this boundary, but the new Kähler cone is a gauge equivalent copy (obtained by an elementary transformation) of the original cone [9, 10]. One can either work with the extended parameter space (the extended movable cone) or restrict oneself to one cone, as we will see below.
3. the collapse of a four-cycle to a zero-cycle results in tensionless strings. In this case no continuation is possible.

In the following we will study the cases (1) and (2), where a continuation is possible. We assume that the Kähler cone can be parametrized by $Y^I > 0$, where Y^I is proportional to the volume of a holomorphic curve which collapses on the boundary $Y^I = 0$.⁴ Then the continuation of the prepotential beyond the boundary $Y^b = 0$, $b \in \{I\}$ is [8, 9, 10]:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{V}}(Y) = \frac{1}{6} \tilde{C}_{IJK} Y^I Y^J Y^K, \quad (5)$$

where

$$\tilde{C}_{IJK} = C_{IJK} + (\delta n_V - \delta n_H) \delta_{Ib} \delta_{Jb} \delta_{Kb}. \quad (6)$$

Here δn_V and δn_H are the numbers of charged vector and hypermultiplets which become massless at $Y^b = 0$.⁵

Now suppose that we have found a solution of (3) such that $Y^I(r) > 0$ for $r > r_*$ and $Y^b(r_*) = 0$. In order to continue the solution to $r < r_*$ we must take into account that the coefficients C_{IJK} change when Y^b changes sign. Therefore the interior solution, where $r < r_*$, is obtained by solving

$$\tilde{C}_{IJK} Y^J Y^K = 2\tilde{H}_I. \quad (7)$$

Then one has to glue the two branches of the solution at $r = r_*$. Note that it is not clear a priori whether the interior solution depends on the same harmonic functions as the exterior solution. Since the general solution depends on $2(n_V + 1)$ parameters, we need to impose $2(n_V + 1)$ conditions to obtain a unique continuation. The natural matching conditions are:

$$Y_{(\text{ext})}^I(r_*) = Y_{(\text{int})}^I(r_*) , \quad F_{tr(\text{ext})}^I(r_*) = F_{tr(\text{int})}^I(r_*) , \quad (8)$$

which require that scalars and gauge fields are continuous at r_* . This implies that the metric is continuous as well, since it is an algebraic function of $\mathcal{V}(Y)$. Note that although the coefficients C_{IJK} jump at $Y^b = 0$, the function $\mathcal{V}(Y)$ is continuous: the only coefficient which changes is C_{bbb} , but this is multiplied with Y^b , which vanishes precisely when C_{bbb} jumps. This type of argument can be used to investigate the behaviour of various quantities at the transition point [12]. The result for the case at hand is as follows:

1. the harmonic functions occurring in the exterior and interior solution are the same, i.e., the parameters c_I and q_I are the same.
2. the scalar fields Y^I are continuously differentiable at r_* , but the second derivatives are discontinuous.

⁴This is always possible for toric Calabi-Yau threefolds, and, more generally, if there is a basis for the homological two-cycles consisting of cycles which are 'nef' (numerically effective). In this basis the C_{IJK} are non-negative. We thank Albrecht Klemm for explaining this to us.

⁵They become massive again for negative Y^b .

3. the function $\mathcal{V}(Y)$ and, hence, the metric is two-times continuously differentiable at $r_\star$. Higher derivatives are discontinuous.

Thus one does not need to introduce a source of stress energy or charge at $r_\star$ in order to continue the solution.

So far our discussion applies equally to flops and to $SU(2)$ gauge symmetry enhancement. But there is a crucial difference, which we have to discuss now. For flops the branches $Y^b > 0$ and $Y^b < 0$ of the extended parameter space are inequivalent, because the corresponding families of Calabi-Yau spaces are not biholomorphically equivalent. This is different for $SU(2)$ enhancement, where Y^b is equivalent to $-Y^b$. In physical terms both values are related by an $SU(2)$ gauge transformation, the Weyl twist, while in geometrical terms they are related by a so-called elementary transformation of divisors. The triple intersection numbers are related by

$$\tilde{C}_{IJK} = C_{MNP} R_I^M R_J^N R_K^P \quad (9)$$

where $(R_I^M) \in GL(n_V + 1, \mathbf{Z})$ satisfies $R_I^M R_N^I = \delta_N^M$. As a consequence the theory based on the prepotential $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}(Y)$ can be obtained from the theory defined by $\mathcal{V}(Y)$ by applying the above transformation. In particular one can obtain the solutions $Y^I = \tilde{f}^I[\tilde{H}]$ of (7) by transforming solutions $Y^I = f^I[H]$ of (3):

$$\tilde{f}^I[\tilde{H}] = R_J^I f^J[\tilde{H} \cdot R] . \quad (10)$$

As discussed above, the matching conditions imply that the same harmonic functions appear in the interior and exterior solution. Therefore a solution crossing an $SU(2)$ boundary takes the form:

$$Y_{(\text{ext})}^I(r) = f^I(H(r)) , \quad \text{for } r > r_\star , \quad (11)$$

$$Y_{(\text{int})}^I(r) = R_J^I f^J(H(r) \cdot R) , \quad \text{for } r < r_\star . \quad (12)$$

For $r < r_\star$ the scalars take values in the reflected cone $\{R_J^I Y^J > 0\}$. Since this is gauge-equivalent to the original cone $\{Y^I > 0\}$, we can also parametrize the solution exclusively in terms of scalars which take values in one of the cones. For example, we can apply the Weyl twist to the interior solution, $Y^I \rightarrow \hat{Y}^I = R_J^I Y^J$ and obtain:

$$Y_{(\text{ext})}^I(r) = f^I(H(r)) , \quad \text{for } r > r_\star , \quad (13)$$

$$\hat{Y}_{(\text{int})}^I(r) = f^I(H(r) \cdot R) , \quad \text{for } r < r_\star . \quad (14)$$

Now the scalars take values inside the original cone for both the exterior and interior part, but one has to apply a gauge transformation when the solution reaches $r_\star$ in order to connect the two branches of the solution.

Let us now return to the issue of singularities. Since (3) cannot be solved in closed form it is difficult to obtain results in a model-independent way. However, the study of a specific family of Calabi-Yau spaces suggests that solutions cannot become singular as long as the scalars take values inside the Kähler cone. We consider the elliptic fibrations over the Hirzebruch surfaces $\mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2$ [17]. Let $Y^I > 0$ be the Kähler cone and introduce new scalars S, T, U by

$$Y^0 = U , \quad Y^1 = T - U , \quad Y^2 = \begin{cases} S - U , & \text{for } \mathcal{F}_0 , \\ S - \frac{1}{2}(T + U) , & \text{for } \mathcal{F}_1 , \\ S - \frac{1}{T} , & \text{for } \mathcal{F}_2 . \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

Though the variables S, T, U are not adapted to the Kähler cone, they are convenient, because the prepotentials of all three models take the same simple form:

$$\mathcal{V} = STU + \frac{1}{3}U^3. \quad (16)$$

In this basis the solution of (3) is [2]:

$$U = \sqrt{\frac{\Delta}{2}}, \quad T = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\Delta}}H_S, \quad S = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\Delta}}H_T, \quad \text{where} \quad \Delta = H_U - \sqrt{H_U^2 - 4H_S H_T}. \quad (17)$$

One finds that there are two situations where (4) becomes singular:

1. $H_S(r_*)H_T(r_*) = 0$, which implies $U(r_*) = 0$. $U = 0$ is a boundary of the Kähler cone where the volume of some of the two-cycles goes to zero while the volumes of others diverge.⁶ The metric on the Kähler cone becomes singular and the five-dimensional effective theory breaks down.
2. $H_U(r_*)^2 = 4H_S(r_*)H_T(r_*)$. This does not correspond to a special locus in moduli space, but the derivatives of the scalars S, T, U diverge whenever the above equation holds. However, if the scalars take values inside the Kähler cone, then $T > U$, which implies $H_U > H_S + H_T$. Thus one reaches the boundary $T = U$ first and the solution is regular at this point.⁷

We conclude that all solutions are regular as long as the scalars take values inside the Kähler cone. Whether a solution becomes singular when the boundary is reached depends on the kind of singularity the internal manifold develops. Note that a solution in the reflected cone is singular if and only if the gauge-equivalent solution in the original cone is singular. Since all solutions in the original cone are regular, it is guaranteed that the continuation of a black hole solution through $SU(2)$ enhancement yields a regular solution.

We have established for our three models that naked singularities are either related to a breakdown of the effective theory at the boundary of the Kähler cone or removed by an enhançon-like mechanism. It is tempting to speculate that this holds generally. We find it suggestive that the linear equation characterising the $SU(2)$ boundary is the discriminante of a quadratic equation which determines the presence or absence of a space-time singularity.

It is straightforward to extend the above analysis to magnetic black string solutions, which take the form [5]:

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= \mathcal{V}(Y)^{-1/3}(-dt^2 + dz^2) + \mathcal{V}(Y)^{2/3}dx_{(3)}^2, \\ F_{mn}^I &= -\varepsilon_{mnp}\partial_p Y^I, \quad \phi^x = Y^x/Y^0. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

This time the rescaled scalars themselves have to be harmonic, $\Delta Y^I = 0$. Thus the analogue of (3) simply is: $Y^I = H^I$. Proceeding in the same way as before one obtains the following results:

1. naked singularities occur if and only if $\mathcal{V}(Y(r_*)) = 0$. This can only happen on the boundary of the Kähler cone. Thus the solution is guaranteed to be regular as

⁶ A more generic realization of this singularity is the collapse of the six-cycle to a four-cycle. In our model this cannot happen because the total volume is fixed. This case is not covered by the above list, and no five-dimensional interpretation is known to the author. However, if one considers type II string theory on the same Calabi-Yau space, then $U = 0$ corresponds to a non-geometrical Landau-Ginsburg phase. We thank Albrecht Klemm for drawing our attention to the string theory interpretation.

⁷ If the solution has been fine-tuned such that $T(r_*) = U(r_*) = S(r_*)$, then the singularity occurs precisely when the boundary is reached. $T = U = S$ is a special point on the boundary where one does not get $SU(2)$ gauge symmetry enhancement, but tensionless strings [16].

long as the scalars take values inside the Kähler cone. Note that in contrast to black holes we are able to prove this for any choice of $\mathcal{V}(Y)$, because we know the solution explicitly in terms of the harmonic functions.

2. black string solutions can be continued through flop transitions and through $SU(2)$ enhancement. The scalars Y^I and the gauge fields are smooth at r_* , whereas the metric is two times continuously differentiable.

Let us now compare our results to analogous results for the domain walls of five-dimensional Horava-Witten theory [11]. Here it was shown that one can continue the bulk solution through flop transitions [12]. This is very similar to the above analysis for black holes. However, for domain walls the scalars are only continuous and the metric is only continuously differentiable. This reflects that one needs to introduce a source of G-flux (though none of stress energy) at the transition point. The case of $SU(2)$ enhancement remains to be analysed and poses new problems, since the $SU(2)$ enhancement is generically incompatible with the background G-flux. We hope to report on this question in a future publication. One can also analyse the question of naked curvature singularities in Horava-Witten domain walls. Since the domain wall solution is determined by an algebraic equation of the form (3), there is a one to one correspondence between domain walls and black holes. It is straightforward to show that a domain wall exhibits a naked curvature singularity if and only if the corresponding black hole solution does. This reflects that both space-time geometries are determined by the same dynamical system on the Kähler cone, as advocated in [14]. Also note that the above analysis of singularities of black holes solutions for a particular set of Calabi-Yau compactifications is identical to the one carried out for the corresponding Horava-Witten domain walls in [2].

Finally we comment on the relation of our results to the enhançon [1]. The point in common is that an apparent naked curvature singularity of a supergravity solution is absent in M-theory because one first runs into $SU(2)$ enhancement. The difference is that enhançon geometries generically require to place branes as sources of charge and stress energy at the transition point. Moreover the interior solution is typically of a different type than the exterior one. Our solution seems closest to a particular type of enhançon solutions where the interior solution is a black hole [15]. It will be interesting to find the relations of the various incarnations of the enhançon mechanism. We close with speculating that there is a universal mechanism in M-theory which avoids space-time singularities by the intervention of additional light modes, which are related to degenerations and topological transitions of the internal space.

Acknowledgement I would like to thank the organisers of the symposium Ahrenshoop 2002 for organizing a stimulating meeting and for the opportunity to present this work, and I thank Laur Järv, Albrecht Klemm, Christoph Mayer, Frank Saueressig and Marco Zagermann for useful discussions and comments on the manuscript.

References

- [1] C. V. Johnson, A. W. Peet and J. Polchinski, Phys. Rev. **D 61** (2000) 086001, hep-th/9911161. C. Johnson, Phys. Rev. **D 63** (2001) 065004, hep-th/0004068.
- [2] R. Kallosh, T. Mohaupt, M. Shmakova, J. Math. Phys. **B 42** (2001) 3071, hep-th/0010271.
- [3] M. Günaydin, G. Sierra, P.K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. **242** (1984) 244.

- [4] B. de Wit and A. Van Proeyen, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **149** (1992) 307, hep-th/9112027.
- [5] A. Chamseddine and W. Sabra, *Phys.Lett.* **B 460** (1999) 63, hep-th/9903046.
- [6] S. Ferrara, R. Kallosh and A. Strominger, *Phys. Rev.* **D 52** (1995) 5412, hep-th/9508072. A. Strominger, *Phys. Lett.* **B 383** (1996) 39, hep-th/9602111. S. Ferrara and R. Kallosh, *Phys. Rev.* **D 54** (1996) 1514 and 1525, hep-th/9602136, hep-th/9603090.
- [7] A. C. Cadavid, A. Ceresole, R. D'Auria and S. Ferrara, *Phys. Lett.* **B 357** (1995) 76, hep-th/9506144. G. Papadopoulos and P. K. Townsend, *Phys. Lett.* **B 357** (1995) 300, hep-th/9506150.
- [8] E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 471** (1996) 195, hep-th/9603150.
- [9] S. Katz, D. R. Morrison and M. R. Plesser, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 477** (1996) 105, hep-th/9601108.
- [10] T. Mohaupt and M. Zagermann, *JHEP* **0112** (2001) 026, hep-th/0109055.
- [11] A. Lukas, B. A. Ovrut, K. S. Stelle and D. Waldram, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 552** (1999) 246, hep-th/9806051.
- [12] B. R. Greene, K. Schalm and G. Shiu, *J. Math. Phys.* **42** (2001) 3171, hep-th/0010207.
- [13] I. Gaida, S. Mahapatra, T. Mohaupt and W. Sabra, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **16** (1999) 419, hep-th/9807014.
- [14] K. Behrndt, S. Gukov and M. Shmakova, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 601** (2001) 49, hep-th/0101119.
- [15] C.V. Johnson and R.C. Myers, hep-th/0105159.
- [16] A. Chou, R. Kallosh, J. Rahmfeld, S.-J. Rey, M. Shmakova and W. K. Wong, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 508** (1997) 147, hep-th/9704014.
- [17] J. Louis, J. Sonnenschein, S. Theisen and S. Yankielowicz, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 480** (1996) 185, hep-th/9606049.